



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/831,845	04/01/1997	BARTLEY H. CALDER	P2167/SUNIP1	9132

22434 7590 11/28/2001

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP
P.O. BOX 778
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778

EXAMINER

BULLOCK JR, LEWIS ALEXANDER

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

T.R.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/831,845

Applicant(s)

CALDER ET AL.

Examiner

Lewis A. Bullock, Jr.

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12-16, and 19-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over COLWELL (US 5,303,361) in view of COPELAND (US 5,815,703).

As to claim 1, COLWELL teaches a computer-implemented framework for associating data (data files) with a command object (viewer module), the command object being arranged to operate on the data, wherein the data is associated with an application (user) (col. 4, lines 35-46), the computer-implemented framework comprising: a data handler mechanism (interface module) arranged to interface with the application (user) (col. 5, lines 23-25); a data retriever mechanism (index module) in communication with the data handler mechanism (user interface module), the data retriever mechanism being arranged to obtain the data (data files) and to pass the data to the data handler mechanism (col. 5, lines 25-34); and a mapping mechanism (viewer manager) in communication with the data handler mechanism (user interface module), the mapping mechanism being separate from the data handler mechanism (col. 8, lines 45-48), the mapping mechanism being arranged to obtain the command object (viewer),

wherein the command object (viewer) is obtained by the mapping mechanism (viewer manager) based substantially on the data (col. 8, line 53 - col. 9, line 17; col. 3, lines 58-62). It would be obvious that an user is invoking the system through an application. It would also be obvious that since the interface module allows the addition of new command objects (viewer modules) without its modification (col. 8, lines 45-50) and the user invokes the system through the interface module, that the application is not modified also. However, COLWELL does not explicitly mention that the user invokes an application for data and a command object and returning such data to the application.

COPELAND teaches an application invoked by a user for retrieving data from a data retriever mechanism by a data handler mechanism without modifying the application (col. 2, line 57 – col. 3, line 11; col. 21, lines 27-47). Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of COLWELL with the teachings of COPELAND in order to access data in a uniform manner (col. 1, line 41-48).

As to claim 9, COLWELL teaches a computer-implemented method for associating data (data files) with a command object (viewer module) in response to a request from an application (user) (col. 4, lines 35-46), the method comprising: accessing the data (data files) through an interface (user interface module) in response to the request from the application (user) (col. 4, lines 53-58; col. 5, lines 25-34), the interface being independent from the application (user) in communication with the application wherein the request from the application is processed by the interface (col. 3, lines 30-32); accessing a mapping mechanism (viewer manager) which is in

communication with the interface (user interface module), the mapping mechanism (viewer manager) being independent from the application (user) such that the mapping mechanism is not a component of the application (col. 8, lines 45-52), the mapping mechanism (viewer manager) being maintained separately from the interface (user interface module) (Fig. 1), the mapping mechanism further being arranged to locate a command object (viewer module) that is appropriate for the data (data file), wherein the mapping mechanism is accessed by the interface (user interface module) (col. 8, line 53 - col. 9, line 17; col. 3, lines 58-62); obtaining the command object (viewer module) that is appropriate for the data (data file), wherein the mapping mechanism obtains the command object and passes the obtained command object to the interface (col. 8, line 53 - col. 9, line 17; col. 3, lines 58-62); binding the command object (viewer module) to the data (data file), where the interface binds the command object to the data (via bid) (col. 8, line 61-col. 9, line 2); and returning the command object to the application, wherein the interface returns the command object to the application (col. 9, lines 13-16). It can be obvious that the user is an invoking application. It would also be obvious that since the interface module allows the addition of new command objects (viewer modules) without its modification (col. 8, lines 45-50) and the user invokes the system through the interface module, that the user invoking application is not modified also. However, COLWELL does not explicitly mention that the user invokes an application for data and a command object and returning such data to the application.

COPELAND teaches an application invoked by a user for retrieving data from a data retriever mechanism by a data handler mechanism without modifying the

Art Unit: 2151

application (col. 2, line 57 – col. 3, line 11; col. 21, lines 27-47). Refer to claim 1 for the motivation to combine.

As to claim 2, COLWELL teaches the data (data file) is a stream of bytes (reads the first 1,000 bytes) (col. 8, lines 56-60), and the data handler mechanism is arranged to bind the stream of bytes to the command object (col. 5, lines 23-49).

As to claim 5, COLWELL teaches the data is one of text data and image data (col. 3, lines 62-65).

As to claim 6, COLWELL teaches the data handler (user interface module) is further arranged to receive a request from the application (user), bind the data to the command object (viewer) (via bid), and to return the command object to the application (col. 5, lines 23-49).

As to claim 8, It would be obvious that since viewer modules bid on data files to see which one processes the file (col 8, line 53 - col. 9, line 17) that the viewer manager can have a table to determine which viewer module can process the file (col. 8, lines 61-68).

As to claim 21, COLWELL teaches the command object (viewer module) is obtained by the mapping mechanism (viewer manager) based substantially on the data (portion of the data file) without an external input from a user of the application (col. 3, lines 57-62).

As to claim 22, COLWELL teaches the command object (viewer module) is obtained by the mapping mechanism (viewer manager) based substantially on the data (portion of the data file) without directly involving the application (col. 3, lines 57-62).

As to claim 26, COLWELL teaches the mapping mechanism (viewer manager) and the data handler mechanism (user interface module) are separately maintained (fig. 1).

As to claim 12, COLWELL teaches accessing a data retriever (index module) which is arranged to obtain the data (data file), wherein the data is a stream of bytes (reads the first 1,000 bytes) (col. 8, lines 56-60).

As to claim 13, COLWELL teaches operating on the data (data file) using the command object (viewer module) (col. 3, lines 58-62).

As to claim 14, COLWELL teaches the command object (viewer module) that is appropriate for the data (data file) is selected from a set of command objects (viewer

modules) (col. 3, lines 58-68). It would be obvious that the viewer modules can be stored in a list and accessed.

As to claim 15, COLWELL teaches receiving a request from the application, the request being received by the interface, wherein the interface performs the steps of: obtaining a type associated with the data (read first portion); obtaining the command list (viewer modules) through the mapping (viewer manager); and returning the command list (viewer modules) to the application (user) (col. 3, lines 58-68; col. 8, line 53 - col. 9, line 17). It would be obvious that since a plurality of viewer modules can be accessed that they can be stored in a list and accessed.

As to claims 16, 19, and 20, reference is made to a computer program product which corresponds to the method of claims 9, 13, and 14 and is therefore met by the rejection of claims 9, 13, and 14 above. Claim 16 also details the mapping mechanism is not a part of the application. It would be obvious that since COLWELL teaches the mapping mechanism is not a component of the application as detailed in claim 9 that is also not a part of the application as claimed.

As to claims 23 and 24, refer to claims 1 and 26 for rejection. However, claim 23 further details the data handler mechanism is independent and interfacing with a plurality of applications. COLWELL teaches the data handler mechanism (user interface module) is independent (col. 3, lines 30-32). It would be obvious that since the

interface module is part of the search and retrieval system and takes request from a users (col. 3, lines 30-32), then it can take request from a plurality of users.

As to claim 25, COLWELL teaches the mapping mechanism (viewer manager) is not a component of the data handler mechanism (user interface module) (fig. 1).

As to claim 27, It would be obvious that since the viewer modules are independent of the interface user module and can be dynamically added without change the interface module (col 8, lines 38-52) then the mapping mechanism (viewer manager) is not specific to the application (user) while the data handler mechanism (user interface module) is specific to the application (directly connected to user) (col. 3, lines 30-32).

Claims 3, 7, 10, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over COLWELL in view of COPELAND as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of PAYNE (US 6,021,433).

As to claim 3, COLWELL teaches the data handler mechanism (user interface module) is further arranged to bind the data object to the command object (col. 8, line 53-col. 9, line 17). However, COLWELL does not teach the data content handler mechanism. PAYNE teaches a data content handler mechanism (content manager of the central broadcast server) in communication with the data handler mechanism (message server design) (col. 6, lines 28-42), the data content handler mechanism

being arranged to convert the data into a data object (col. 8, lines 26-47). Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of COLWELL with the teachings of COPELAND and PAYNE in order to dynamically access data (col. 2, lines 42-64).

As to claim 7, COLWELL teaches the data handler mechanism (user interface module) is arranged to bind the data object (data file) to the command object (viewer module) (col. 8, line 53 - col. 9, line 17). However, COLWELL does not teach the data content mechanism or the data source mechanism. PAYNE teaches a data source mechanism (information sources / servers) arranged to obtain a stream of bytes (col. 7, lines 43-56) and a data content handler mechanism (content manager) arranged to convert the stream of bytes into a data object (col. 8, lines 26-47), the data source mechanism being in communication with the data content handler mechanism (fig. 2). Refer to claim 3 for the motivation to combine.

As to claim 10, COLWELL and COPELAND substantially disclose the invention. However, COLWELL does not teach the data content handler mechanism. PAYNE teaches: passing a stream of bytes (information) to a data content handler mechanism (content manager) arranged to create a data object (compressed) from the stream of bytes; and passing the data object to the interface (message server design) (col. 6, lines 28-42), wherein the data is the data object (compressed). Refer to claim 3 for the motivation to combine.

As to claim 17, reference is made to a computer program product which corresponds to the method of claim 10 and is therefore met by the rejection of claim 10 above.

Claims 4, 11, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over COLWELL in view of COPELAND and PAYNE as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of "The Java Language Environment" by SUN.

As to claim 4, all of the cited references substantially disclose the invention above. However, neither reference teaches the cited functionality. SUN teaches the data object (object) is created using the Java programming language, and the command object is a Java command object (Java code to support object) (pg. 77-78). Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of COLWELL with the teachings of COPELAND, PAYNE, and SUN in order to dynamically perform or add capabilities (pg. 75-76, 72).

As to claim 11, all of the cited references substantially disclose the invention above. However, neither teach the cited functionality. SUN teaches the data object (object) is created using the Java programming language, and the command object is a Java command object (Java code to support object) (pg. 77-78). Refer to claim 4 for the motivation to combine.

As to claim 18, reference is made to a computer program product which corresponds to the method of claim 11 and is therefore met by the rejection of claim 11 above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/10/01 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued that the Colter does not teach allowing the use of new command objects without modifying the application. However, as shown at col. 8, lines 45-50, Colter teaches that the interface module operates independently of the application specific viewers and that it is possible to add more viewer modules without changing the interface module. Therefore, since the user communicates with the system through the interface module and the interface module is not changed when new specific viewers are added the user is thereby not changed. The new cited art of COPELAND teaches that a user invokes the display of any type of data from a data source through an application (generic browser) without modifying that application. This is achieved through the independent API of the system. It would be obvious that the data sources would not only store the specific data but also how to view it. Therefore, the combination of the prior art teachings disclose Applicant's invention as claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Lewis A. Bullock, Jr. whose voice telephone number is (703) 305-0439. A voice mail service is also available at this number.

Art Unit: 2151

- All responses sent by U.S. Mail should be mailed to:
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231
- Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park Two, 2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist). All hand-delivered responses will be handled and entered by the docketing personnel. Please do not hand deliver responses directly to the Examiner.

IMPORTANT CHANGE IN PTO FAX POLICY:

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to: (703) 746-7238.
- OFFICIAL faxes must be signed and sent to: (703) 746-7239.
- NON OFFICIAL faxes should not be signed, please send to: (703) 746-7240.

All OFFICIAL faxes will be handled and entered by the docketing personnel. The date of entry will correspond to the actual FAX reception date unless that date is a Saturday, Sunday, or a Federal Holiday within the District of Columbia, in which case the official date of receipt will be the next business day. The application file will be promptly forwarded to the Examiner unless the application file must be sent to another area of the Office, e.g., Finance Division for fee charging, etc.

To avoid ongoing Washington D.C. area mail processing delays, the Examiner requests that Applicant direct all communications to the PTO by fax. All incoming faxes are securely stored on PTO computers that are dedicated to fax reception. If you send a fax, please do not send duplicate papers via U.S. mail.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Lewis A. Bullock, Jr.
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151

ST. JOHN COURTENAY III
PRIMARY EXAMINER

